Stuart H. Schultz, #2886
Byron G. Martin, #8824
STRONG & HANNI
Attorneys for Defendants Clayton B. McCullough and
Pratt-Thomas Walker, P.A.
3 Triad Center, Suite 500
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180
Telephone: (801) 532-7080
Facsimile: (801) 323-1508

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

CENTRAL DIVISION

MICHAEL E. ANDERER,)	
Plaintiff,)	
VS.))	OBJECTION TO PROPOSED
C2 SYSTEMS, LLC., a Delaware limited liability company; JOHN RUDD; STEPHEN))	ORDER ON MOTION TO REMAND
A. BRYANT; KENDALL BRYANT; SUN TRUST BANKS, INC., DBA SUN TRUST))	
BANK, ATLANTA; JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., a national bank; CLAYTON B.)	
MCCULLOUGH; PRATT-THOMAS)	Case No. 2:09-cv-00077-DB
WALKER, P.A.)	Judge Dee Benson
Defendants.)	

Defendants Clayton B. McCullough and Pratt-Thomas Walker, P. A. (hereinafter "Pratt-Thomas") object to plaintiff's proposed Order on Motion to Remand and for the Just Costs and Any Actual Expenses Including Attorney Fees, Incurred as the Result of Removal. It appears the plaintiff's proposed Order would include an award of costs, expenses and attorney fees

Pratt-Thomas has appeared specially in this case by way of Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction. In making this Objection, Pratt-Thomas maintains their special appearance.

Pratt-Thomas objects to that portion of paragraph 1 of the proposed Order awarding costs and expenses, including attorney fees, incurred as a result of the removal, and all of paragraph 3 of the proposed order ordering plaintiff to submit an affidavit of attorney's fees, costs and expenses for review by the parties and counsel and response and for further hearing by the Court concerning an award of fees and costs under 28 U.S.C § 1447(c).

Pratt-Thomas' objection to the above-referenced portions of plaintiff's proposed Order is based on the following grounds:

1. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c), the statute upon which plaintiff bases his claim for an award of costs, expenses, and attorney's fees, states, in pertinent part:

An order remanding the case <u>may</u> require payment of just costs and any actual expenses, including attorney fees, incurred as a result of the removal. [emphasis added].

The statute does not mandate an award of costs, expenses and attorney fe es, but makes it discretionary with the Court. Since it is discretionary, plaintiff cannot assume that the Court exercised that discretion in his favor absent some specific ruling by the Court that included such an award of expenses, costs and fees.

In <u>Baldwin v. Fresenius Medical Care</u>, 2007 U.S.Dist. Lexis 46018(D. Utah 2007), the Court granted a Motion to Remand, but denied a request for costs, expenses and fees. The

Court stated:

Lastly, section 1447(c) provides that "[a]n order remanding the case may require payment of just costs and any actual expenses, including attorney fees, incurred as a result of the removal." Although the court granted Baldwin's motion to remand, this statute does not require a grant of attorney fees as a matter of course. [citing Martin v. Franklin Capital Corp., 546 U.S. 132, 126 S. Ct. 704, 709, 163 L.Ed. 2d 547 (2005)]. Courts should award attorney fees under this statute "only where the removing party lacked an objectively reasonable basis for seeking removal." [citing Id.] The court finds that Fresenius had an objectively reasonable basis for seeking removal and, therefore, declines to make an award of attorney fees in this case.

Thus, unless this Court specifically concluded that there was no objectively reasonable basis for seeking removal, there can be no award of fees, costs and expenses.

2. A review of the transcript of the May 15, 2009, Motion to Remand hearing indicates there was no discussion of an award of costs, expenses and fees by any of the counsel, or by the Court in the Court's ruling granting the Motion to Remand. The Court did not find that there was no objectively reasonable basis for removal, as required in Martin v. Franklin Capital Corp., supra. Absent such finding, there is no support for plaintiff to include such an award in his proposed Order.

Pratt-Thomas respectfully requests that the Court sustain their objection to the proposed Order and require that any reference to an award of fees, expenses, and costs be removed.

DATED this day of August, 2009.

STRONG & HANNI

Stuart H. Schultz

Byron G. Martin

Attorneys for Defendants Clayton B. McCullough and Pratt-Thomas

Walker, P.A.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

the foregoing Objection to Proposed Order on Motion to Remand, et al. was served by the method indicated below, to the following:

David W. Scofield Thomas William Peters PETERS SCOFIELD 115 Parleys Corporate Center 2455 Parleys Way Salt Lake City, UT 84109	() () () (√)	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile CM/ECF System
John R. Lund P. Matthew Cox Snow, Christensen & Martineau 10 Exchange Place, 11th Floor Salt Lake City, UT 84145-5000	() () () ()	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile CM/ECF System
Douglas L. Stowell Adam L. Crayk STOWELL & CRAYK, PLLC 525 South 300 East, Suite 200 Salt Lake City, UT 84111	() () () (√)	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile CM/ECF System
David R. Hall John P. Ball, Jr. PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER One Utah Center 201 South Main Street Salt Lake City, UT 84111	() () () ()	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile CM/ECF System
Stephen A. Bryant 108 Forest View Peachtree City, GA 30269	(\forall) () () ()	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile CM/ECF System

Kendall Bryant 108 Forest View Peachtree City, GA 30269 (√) U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid() Hand Delivered

() Overnight Mail

() Facsimile

() CM/ECF System

004233.00119